REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to put it back in its initial form since the Examiner has withdrawn the previous indication that such a claim would be allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection fails to show how the claim could read on the combination of the two references, even assuming such a combination were patentably permissible. In particular, the office action is vague as to what is the asserted "application" and what is the asserted "video server."

In the cited reference to Semenzato, a plug-in apparently operates with a browser to provide video. It is unclear which of these two elements would be considered the server and which of the two elements would be considered the application. It is respectfully submitted that the plug-in cannot be the application because it is the plug-in that provides the video upon request from some other entity. Thus, the discussion in the office action about the crashing of the plug-in is irrelevant since the claim calls for a situation in which only the crashing of the application requesting the video is pertinent.

Again, it appears that the cited references have no reasonable relationship to the claims. They do not reasonably relate to an application requesting video and a video server providing that video. As currently positioned, the office action fails to make out a *prima facie* rejection because it does not point out anything that could possibly be the application that crashes.

Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the art of record. On a similar analysis, the other rejected claims should also be patentable.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 12, 2004

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]